

**REMARKS**

A request for a one month extension of time accompanies this response and is filed on the same date.

There are 35 claims pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 and 19.

Amendments to the claims have been made to address the formality objections raised by the examiner, to clarify the scope of the claims, and to ensure proper antecedent basis in a dependent claim, where the parent claims has been amended.

Applicant has made the requested formality related amendments. Applicant submits that in view of these amendments, the objections are now moot, and kindly requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,054,906 to Levosky.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “a request interface, for receiving a pseudonymous email address generation request from one of an external web server in response to the creation of a webpage hosted by the external web server and an identity management system...”

Applicant respectfully submits that such a request interface is not taught in the Levosky reference.

Levosky is directed to an email alias generation system. The system makes use of an alias server in communication with a mail server, and responsive to requests for generation received from a standalone application executed on the user's local system, as described in column 4 beginning at line 21, which describes the “client control program called “SpamMotel.exe”, which resides on the client's computer...”

The application is executed by the user, and when the user encounters a webpage requesting an email address, or otherwise wants to generate an email address, the application is used to generate a request which is then transmitted to the server, as described at column 4 line 63. The

response from the server is received by the client application and then is copied to the user's clipboard, as described in column 5 between lines 19 and 25. This allows the user to use the paste command to insert the generated alias into the web-based form.

Applicant submits that this generation of a pseudonymous email address, referred to in Levensky as an alias, is done in response to a generation request generated by a standalone application.

In describing an alternate embodiment, at column 7 line 38 to column 8 line 13, Levensky describes the ability of the alias generator to be combined with a mail server for use with web-based email services. Levensky describes that the user can control generation of aliases using a web browser plug-in (column 7 lines 61-62) or an email client program (column 7 lines 66-67).

Applicant notes that at no point does Levensky teach or teach towards the generation of an aliased email address in response to a request "from one of an external web server in response to the creation of a webpage hosted by the external web server and an identity management system..."

Applicant notes that the web-based email service taught by Levensky does not generate an aliased (or pseudonymous) email address in response to the creation of a webpage, and instead only teaches generation in response to a user request. Additionally, the Applicant notes that Levensky is silent on the generation of aliases in response to a request from an identity management system.

Applicant notes that as Levensky is silent on the generation of aliases in response to these criteria, it cannot be considered to teach a pseudonymous email address generator having "a request interface, for receiving a pseudonymous email address generation request from one of an external web server in response to the creation of a webpage hosted by the external web server and an identity management system..." as recited by claim 1.

Applicant notes that as Levensky does not teach the request interface recited in claim 1, it cannot anticipate the matter of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that the generation of pseudonymous email addresses in response to requests generated in response to the creation of webpages, and from identity management systems, provides a distinct and quantifiable advantage over the existing art. By being responsive to requests generated in response to the creation of a webpage, the system of the present invention allows companies to provide a link to an email address on a webpage that will reduce the amount of unsolicited commercial email (UCE). As described in the application as filed, senders of UCE often harvest email addresses posted to websites. By dynamically generating an email address that can be for one-time-use, the webpage prevents any address harvested by senders of UCE from becoming an ongoing source of UCE messages.

Similarly, a user making use of an identity management system, when prompted to provide an email address, can use the identity management system to provide an aliased email address that permits the user to terminate the address upon receipt of UCE. This allows the user to reduce the amount of UCE received, as once UCE is received, the address can be deactivated and further UCE will not arrive.

Applicant notes, that claims 2, and 4-8 depend on claim 1, and thus are no broader in scope than claim 1. As claim 1 is submitted as being patentable in view of the Levensky reference. Applicant submits that all claims properly depending from claim 1 are also patentable in view of the Levensky reference. Accordingly Applicant reiterates the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, applies them to claims 2 and 4-8, and requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4-8 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that the Examiner rejected claim 3 as being obvious under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Levensky and US Patent Publication no. 2004/0177110 to Rounthwaite. Applicant notes that the teachings of the Rounthwaite reference are used to introduce the concept of a honey pot address. Applicant further notes that Rounthwaite is silent on the generation of a pseudonymous email address in response to the generation of a webpage or in response to a request from an identity manager. Applicant has previously indicated that Levensky fails to teach those features of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Levensky and Rounthwaite fail to teach the matter of claim 3, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite:

a mail receiving engine for receiving an email message from an email address for distribution to a mailing list and for determining that the email address is an address registered to the mailing list;  
a pseudonymous email address creator, for creating a pseudonymous email address associated with both a mail server and the email address associated with the received email message, for providing the created pseudonymous email address and the associated email address to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address, and for replacing the email address associated with the received email message with the created pseudonymous email address prior to the distribution of the message to addresses registered to the mailing list.

Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Levensky are directed to an aliased email address generator, which may be combined with a mail server. Levensky does not teach the use of an aliased email address generator in conjunction with a mailing list server. Mailing list servers receive email; determine that the email received is from a registered user; and distribute the received email to other registered users.

Mailing lists are often targeting by senders of UCE. The only way that a system such as that taught in the Levensky reference can protect the members of a mailing list, is to have each of the mailing list member sign up for the list using an aliased email address. When UCE is received, the user would then be required to deactivate the aliased address and sign up for the list with a new alias. Clearly, this is not a feasible system. With the system of claim 9, the mailing list server handles generation of aliased addresses for all users, so that each aliased address can be individually deactivated without impacting upon the user's registration to a mailing list.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made to claim 9 are clarifying in nature, are fully supported by the specification as filed, and clearly provide patentable differentiation between the teachings of Levensky and the matter of claim 9.

Applicant submits that in view of the above discussion with regard to claim 9 as amended, the teachings of the Levensky reference do not anticipate the matter of claim 9, and as such,

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to reflect the language of claim 9 as amended.

Applicant submits that as claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, they are no broader in scope than claim 9. As such, Applicant reiterates the arguments presented above with respect to claim 9 and applies them to claims 10 and 11. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 10, Applicant further notes that the Leovsky reference does not teach parsing the body of an email message to identify email addresses present in the body of the message so that they can be replaced with aliased or pseudonymous email addresses, as is recited in claim 10. As such, Applicant submits that Leovsky does not teach the matter of claim 10.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Leovsky. Applicant notes that claim 12, as amended, recites: “a rule-based pseudonymous email address processing engine, *...for attaching a management link to the received message* in accordance with a predefined preference associated with the pseudonymous email address.”

Applicant notes that this feature is fully described in the specification. A management link embedded in an email message allows the user to deactivate or modify the mail handling rules for a pseudonymous email address while viewing the address. This provides management functionality in each message processed by the mail server. Attaching a management link is not taught in the Leovsky reference. The Examiner has directed attention to column 7 lines 1-8, which makes reference to Figure 7. Figure 7 of the Leovsky reference is not a view illustrating a mail message. Instead it is a view indicating a log of received messages. The log is viewed through a viewing application, which in this embodiment is a web application. This is implemented by displaying a log of the received email messages, and providing an opportunity for the user to modify mail routing preferences from the log view. Leovsky does not teach attaching the mail management links to the email message itself, as recited in claim 12.

Attaching a link to the message allows the user to control mail handling rules regardless of the application used to view the mail message, and does not specifically require a separate viewing application. The Examiner also made reference to column 9 line 62 through column 9 line 12. Applicant concedes that these are mail-handling options, but notes that at no point does Leovsky provide a mechanism for the user to access these options from the received email message itself through an attached management link. Instead the user would be required to either use the standalone application, or use the log view discussed earlier.

As, Levensky fails to teach a the feature of a pseudonymous email address processing engine which attaches a management link to the received message, as recited in claim 12, Applicant submits that claim 12 is not anticipated by Levensky, and as such, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that claims 13-18 depend from claim 12, either directly or indirectly, and as such include all the features of claim 12. As claims 13-18 include the features of claim 12, none of them can be broader in scope than claim 12. As claim 12 is submitted as being patentable in view of Levensky, Applicant reiterates the arguments presented above with respect to claim 12 and applies them to claims 13-18. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 13-18 under 25 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by the Levensky reference. Applicant has amended claim 19 so that the step of defining a set of preferences recites, "defining a set of preferences associated with the pseudonymous email address including a management link style."

Applicant notes, that as discussed above, with respect to claim 12, the use of a management link is not taught in the Levensky reference. As such, without teaching a management link, Levensky cannot be considered to have taught a management link style. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Levensky does not teach the matter of claim 19 as amended.

Applicant requests that as Levensky does not teach the matter of claim 19 as amended, the rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that claims 20-28 depend from claim 19, either directly or indirectly, and as such include the matter of claim 19. As claims 20-28 each include the matter of claim 19, Applicant reiterates the arguments presented above with respect to claim 19, and applies them to each of claims 20-28. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the matter of each of claims 20-28 is not taught by the Levensky reference, and thus requests that the rejection under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 25 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Levensky.

Applicant notes that claim 29, as amended, recites the step of "attaching a management link to the message in one of a predetermined number of styles". Applicant respectfully submits that, as discussed with regard to claims 12 and 19, Levensky does not teach, or teach towards, attaching a management link to a mail message. Accordingly, Applicant reiterates the arguments presented above regarding the failure to teach attaching a management link, and applies the arguments to claim 29. Applicant submits that in view of these arguments, Levensky does not teach the matter of claim 29. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 USC 102(c) be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that claims 30-35 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 29, and include all the matter of claim 29. As such, Applicant submits that claims 30-35 cannot be broader in scope than claim 29 from which they depend, and thus reiterates the arguments presented above with respect to claim 29 and applies them to claims 30-35. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 30-35 under 35 USC 102(c) be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits action to that end.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dick C. HARDT

By: /Dilip C. Andrade/

Dilip C. Andrade

Reg. No. 53,942

Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP

90 Sparks Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

Ottawa ON K1P 1E2

CANADA

Tel: (613) 566-2270

Fax: (613) 238-8775

Email: dandrade@perlaw.ca